

The Church and Education

PETER FINLAY, S. J.

The Irish Catholic

"**E** DUCATION," though a process that should continue throughout life, is commonly understood to be concerned especially with the training of the young. It includes instruction, as, of course, the teaching of facts of various kinds. In the ruder stages of human society the facts will be of the simplest nature; the ways and means, for instance, of procuring the necessities of life. In the more advanced, they will tend to become more complex and abstruse, and generally less useful. But, whatever they may be: facts of physical science, of past history, of language, mathematics, and the like, a knowledge of facts is only a very partial result of true education. To educate is to "draw out," to cultivate, what is good in man, the gifts and capabilities which are born with him, but at birth are weak and undeveloped. For his own sake, for the sake of society, of which he is a member, the child must grow: in body, mind, will, heart, and conscience. For this growth he is largely dependent, in the earlier years of life, upon others. In civilized society others tend him, feed and clothe and house him. They train him in games and other bodily exercises. They teach him arts and sciences. They endeavor to form his character, to make him upright, honorable, kindly, affectionate, courageous; an embodiment of natural virtues. And in the Christian Church, they must tell him of the supernatural and of Christ Our Lord; they must instruct him in the teachings of Christ, and form him to think and act according to Christ's teachings and example. They give him a pagan education, if they themselves are pagans; a Christian education, if they are Christians.

And the object of this education is to fit men for life, for life in this world, whatever the educator's beliefs may be; for life here and hereafter, if the educator accepts the doctrines of Christianity. Education, we have already remarked, is never complete, while life endures: for every stage of life is a preparation for what is to follow, and all life on earth is a preparation for eternity. But we propose at present to consider education as concerned with the

time of youth, and among a people professedly Christian; and we ask what that education should be.

HOW MUCH EDUCATION IS NEEDED?

It is plain that no scheme can be framed which shall be applicable universally; the nature of all preparatory work is to be determined by that other work or state for which it is a preparation. No doubt there is a minimum of training, bodily, mental, moral, and religious, which should be given to all; though what that minimum is, it would be extremely difficult to determine. It should be such as to produce a *mens sana in corpore sano*, a sound mind in a sound body; but how much further should it go? In these days of obligatory school attendance, and school clinics, and continuation schools, and university-extension lectures, and multitudinous exhibitions and scholarships, there is a danger of coming to regard mere schooling, whether in the primary, secondary, or university stage, as an end in itself; a thing which all should aim at; and which the State, for its own sake, and in justice to the community, should place, so far as may be possible, within reach of all. It is assumed, of course, that every citizen should be able to read and write and cast accounts; that he will be a happier and more useful citizen because of his ability to do so; and that then a way should be open to him by which he may, if he chooses, mount through higher education to the loftiest dignities in the State. It is no part of our present purpose to discuss the theory, a theory which the modern democratic State is commonly disposed to accept unquestioningly, and to put in practise at an ever-increasing expense of time, energy, and money. There are those who are skeptically-minded, and who doubt that the diffusion of even elementary knowledge, of reading, writing, and such primary subjects, divorced, as it is too frequently, from religious training, makes men and women happier as individuals or more excellent members of the civil commonwealth. But we shall have occasion, somewhat later, to consider the reasons for their skepticism, and to estimate the value of the conclusions to which they come. Here, we shall allow that it is desirable to give to all our children the fullest measure which may be possible of secular and of religious knowledge, according to each one's present state and the future he may hope for.

It is evident that the branches of secular and of religious knowledge are not all equally within the range of youthful minds, and are not equally important in their bearing on the future. A selection must be made, that any education may be possible; a wise selection should be made, as future interests may demand. So much will be generally admitted, by way of abstract principles. But it is otherwise when we come to their application. No complaint is more widespread, at least among ourselves, than that our children of every class, in both primary and secondary schools, are overburdened with a multiplicity of subjects; and, more serious still, that the place assigned these subjects in our schemes of education corresponds very imperfectly, sometimes not at all, with their relative importance, and with their bearing upon the scholars' future. It is urged, for instance, that in our popular girls' schools practical housewifery, dressmaking, mending, knitting, cookery, and other such domestic arts, should never be sacrificed, as they often are, to literary studies, to music or other unnecessary accomplishments. It is far more vital to the welfare and happiness of the worker and his family, and of his wife herself, that she should be able to do, and do well, everything needed in the home than that she should have played a piano in her school days, or recited poetical extracts, or joined in choral singing.

We are not, however, directly concerned with considerations such as these, insofar as they relate to education in its purely secular aspects, and we have only introduced them here because of their bearing on the question in which we are mainly interested, the place which religion ought to hold in education.

RELIGION IN EDUCATION

Religion, the true religion, is, we may assume, the most important element in human life. A man may, many men do, accept all the teachings of religion, in theory, and yet lead irreligious and vicious lives. It is easier to believe in the Trinity than to observe the Commandments; and, such is the nature of our freedom of will, unhesitating faith is not inseparable from the good works which faith enjoins upon believers. But the contradiction which we so often witness, which, indeed, we experience within ourselves, be-

tween religious belief and moral conduct, is not to be charged upon religion. The more thorough our knowledge of revealed doctrines, the more whole-hearted our assent to them, the more steadfast our resolve to govern our life by them, the better men we shall be, better to our own conscience, better in our homes, and better citizens. Indeed, there can be no true morality, either private or public, unless it be based upon revealed religion. For proof we need only appeal to the history of paganism; the man who should profess openly its ethical standards as we find them set out in the golden age of Greek and Roman literature would now be ostracized by all decent-minded persons. There can be no true sense of moral law and obligation without reference to a Divine Legislator; nor of moral sanction, without a Divine Ruler and Judge. In the interest, therefore, of the individual, of the family, and of the State itself, religion should have its place in education. And a principal place. It is all important, in private and in public life, that a man should have an enlightened conscience, a high sense of duty, a conviction of his responsibility to an all-seeing authority, and of just and inevitable rewards and punishments; and it is only the religious element in education that will bestow these precious gifts upon him and train him to their use.

Furthermore, education, as we have said, is not a preparation for this life only; it has a higher purpose, to prepare us for eternity. That is, indeed, its chief purpose; as it should be of every other activity in life. And it prepares for eternity, not by instruction in languages, science, art, agriculture or commerce, none of which things is of any help toward happiness with God in heaven, but by teaching man to know Christ, His doctrines, and His institutions; by molding man's character in the pattern of Christ; by forming him to obey God's law, to overcome temptation, to avoid sin, to practise virtue, to keep habitually in mind God's good-will and pleasure, and the salvation of the soul. These are the essential things of life. To do these things is to lead a religious life; to fit man for the doing of them, to create the will and habit of doing them conscientiously, should be the first and chief aim of education; and, if it be, religion must be the principal, all-pervading, element in education. Not the sole element; for, as we have said, to educate is to draw out what is best

in man, in body, mind, and spirit. But if there be any truth in Christianity, religion should hold first place in life and training; and there can be no education worthy of the name in which it does not hold first place.

WHOSE IS THE RIGHT TO EDUCATE?

And whose is the duty, whose the right to give this education? Duty and right belong inalienably to parents. Naturally, by the very fact of birth, a child is under his parents' care. It is for them to nurse him, feed him, clothe him, house him; for them also to educate him. They may, of course, employ other hands, they must commonly employ other hands, to aid them in the work. In a civilized community there must be a "division of labor"; men cannot all sow, and reap, and weave, and bake, and build, and themselves exercise all the other trades, on which their own well-being and that of a family depend; they must look to others to supply their need. So, too, it is in education. Parents may, many must, confide to others the education, at least the partial education, of their children; they themselves have neither time nor competency. But the responsibility, the duty, are their own; these they cannot transfer to any other. They are bound by the law of nature and the law of God to provide food and clothing and all necessities for the reasonable material welfare and bodily development of their children. They are equally bound to provide for the welfare and suitable development of their children's minds and hearts. To starve a child's intellect and will is no less criminal in a parent than to starve his body.

And as it is a parent's duty, so it is a parent's right, while he is willing and able to fulfil the duty, to control the education of his child. In the exercise of this right, no one may lawfully interfere, still less dictate to him. No one may prescribe for him how he shall feed the child, or clothe, or house, or teach and train it, while he is himself prepared to do all of these things, within reasonable time and measure.

The State has no such right of interference. The tendency of governments has always been to limit, to encroach upon the rights and liberties of their subjects. Uniformity, centralization, bureaucracy, absolutism are the expression of this tendency, when the people allow it

to succeed for a time in the never-ending struggle. Then popular discontent, civil uprisings, political revolutions, peaceful or violent, follow; and the people often regain the liberties which had been filched from them. Profane history, both of ancient and of modern times, is largely the record of this conflict between the State and its citizens; and Rome, Greece, medieval Italy, the France, Spain, Naples of the Bourbons, Russia and Prussia in our own day, will occur to the mind as examples of it. Much modern legislation among ourselves betrays the same tendency. Our land laws, game laws, factory and shop acts, compulsory insurance, boards, departments, commissions; all make for an increase of central authority, and for a restriction of individual liberties. Such, too, has been the bent of Parliamentary interference with education. Compulsory school attendance, inspection of schools, free instruction and even free school meals, uniformity in school program and standards, public examinations, government training and registration of teachers; and, in the university the creation of a State-granted, closely guarded monopoly, from which religion is carefully excluded, to which only those have access who can spend much time and money in centers appointed for them, attending upon teachers not of their parents' choice; all this modern legislation moves towards an increasing control of education by the State, or by State-established and irresponsible bodies, with a corresponding restriction of individual liberty. We are not concerned now with the wisdom or need of such legislation; we merely note the tendency of the State, of the governing classes in the State, to gather power and control into their own hands, and thus to overrule the rights and liberties of individuals and of the people.

THE RIGHTS OF THE STATE

Now, it is not denied, it cannot be denied, that the State is justified at times in limiting the exercise of liberty and of natural rights. No one doubts that it may impose necessary taxation, and assume control of private property in cases of war, detain persons suspected of crime, remove children from the guardianship of grossly immoral parents, and do a hundred other things which take from the freedom of its subjects. But how far may it proceed?

Whence is its right to interfere with a citizen's liberty at all?

We have already noted that the individual and the family are prior to the State. "It is not good for man to be alone"; and hence by a law of nature the family comes into being. The family is not sufficient for itself; and hence family joins with family to constitute the State. But the individual has rights and liberties which the family may not infringe; and the individual and the family have rights and liberties which the State may not violate. Indeed, family is led to join with family, and thus to constitute the State for two objects only: to protect the rights of the family and of the individual, and to further the prosperity of all. It is for this governments are appointed: this is the whole foundation of their duties and their rights. They are the servants, not the masters, of the people. Authority is given them that they may safeguard and promote the well-being of all. They may employ whatever lawful means are necessary for that purpose. Except for that purpose, and beyond those necessary means, they have no authority whatsoever. The limits of State action are determined by the reasons for setting up the State.

Hence, all unnecessary interference with the rights or liberty of a citizen is unjust and tyrannical. The State may not prescribe for him where he shall live, how he shall be clothed, what he shall eat, whom he shall marry, what profession he shall adopt, and so forth, unless State interference be required to protect the rights of others or to advance a great and common good.

And hence the State may not, unless under like conditions, set bounds to a parent's freedom in the education of his children. It cannot take over their education itself, unless the parent consents or makes default. It cannot force them into its schools or determine the scheme of their instruction. It has just the same right, no greater, no less, to interfere in the education of its subjects which it has to interfere in their lodging, food, and clothing.

The State, we have seen, may not interfere with a parent's right and duty to educate his child, so long as the parent himself is competent and willing to fulfil the duty. The child belongs to his parents; he is not the property of the State. To take him from his parents'

care, to force him into institutions of its own; to feed, to clothe, to instruct him, against his parents' will, while they themselves are prepared to give him all that his own welfare and the common good require, is a plain and unjust invasion of parental rights. Compulsory education, therefore, understood of a State law which should take children from their homes and herd them into State schools and subject them to a State program of instruction, is an utterly unwarrantable violation of the home, if they are already provided with the education which the law of nature and the law of God demand. And this truth is of universal application: the poorest parent in the land has the same rights, the same independence of State interference and State control, as the wealthiest and most learned.

PARENTS' RIGHT TO EDUCATE

Hence, his right to educate his child in his own home is not restricted to the training and instruction which he may give himself. He may freely call in the assistance of others. If he do, he must see to it that those others give what he is bound to provide; he must make sure in choosing them that they are suited for the duty he entrusts to them, but, in making the choice, he cannot be called on to seek either authorization or guidance from the State. As well allow the State to determine who shall bake his children's bread, or serve them when they sit at table.

Hence, too, he may send his children to any teacher whom he chooses, and who is qualified to give the education which the children may justly claim. And, again, in making this choice, he is in no wise dependent on the State. Parents are as free to choose a teacher in common for their children, and to send the children to a common center where he may teach them, as they are to bring the teacher of their choice into their own homes.

And hence the right to teach and to establish schools is not a privilege which the State may at its discretion withhold or grant, or in any way limit or control. If a State certificate, or any other certificate, were necessary, the parent's right to educate his child would be at the mercy of the State or of some State-created licensing authority; and the parent's right, as we have seen, is

prior to the State and independent of it. The State may have the right at times to establish common schools, when such action is needed to protect the common welfare against the evils of ignorance. But if private effort has already provided fitting schools, or desires to provide them, there are many who will deny all State right to undertake the work of education. It would be as easy, they say, to justify the expenditure of public money upon picture-theaters and traveling circuses. Government interference or competition with private enterprise cannot be justified on the ground that the State is as competent to carry out the work as individual citizens, perhaps more competent. A government is not set up, authority is not vested in it, that it may do what families, and individuals are willing and able to do for themselves. Government action, as we have seen, is reasonable and just when it is necessary, necessary for the protection of individual rights or of the well-being of the community. Otherwise, it is an usurpation, an exercise of authority which has not been given to the State, and which it is not to the interest of the people that it should be given. Liberty, freedom of initiative, freedom of private choice and action, is of far more importance to a nation than any good result which can come from the uncalled for interference of the State.

STATE MONOPOLY

The State, therefore, can have no right to create a school monopoly in its own favor: it may not, while establishing its own schools, forbid others. Most modern Governments make proof of a desire to do so. The democratic French Republic has expelled the Religious teaching Orders, and has, so far as possible, closed all primary and secondary schools except its own; its University, too, is a State institution. In Prussia, Saxony, and Bavaria prior to the recent war, all education was practically in the hands of the State. We see the same tendency in the present-day legislation of England, the United States, Australia, and other countries. Parents who wish to exercise their right of choosing for their children the teachers, however competent and qualified, whom they themselves prefer, are generally punished—fined, for doing so. They are compelled to pay for pub-

lic schools, of which they do not, perhaps cannot conscientiously, avail themselves; and they must pay as well for the education of their children in the schools of their choice. In all these countries Catholics suffer under a very grave injustice. They may not send their children to the Government schools; for such schools are almost necessarily non-sectarian: denominational religion is banished from them. And so they must, if permitted, maintain schools of their own, and at the same time contribute towards maintaining the schools of others. The trend of modern legislation is to discourage all private educational effort, and to create a monopoly for the State. Pre-Reformation Europe was wiser when it accepted the great Catholic principle of individual liberty, and in education, as in many other matters, interfered only, when it interfered at all, to further private endeavor. There was no disposition then to allow the materialistic theory that children, like their parents, are the property of the State; that they belong to the State, as slave children to the slave owner; and that it is for the State to determine what their education and training shall be. Nor is the theory much to be wondered at, if once it be assumed, as latter-day democracy is coming to assume, that the State is bound to take the parents' place, and fulfil the parents' natural duties, bound to provide schools, books, teachers, oculists, doctors and dentists, even food, and soon it may be clothing—for there is no logical halting place—with public moneys. If the State pays all the cost it is not surprsing it should claim a preponderant share in the administration; should claim to appoint and dismiss teachers, to frame program, to supervise and control the whole school work and life of the scholars. I do not say the claim is just, or ought to be admitted; but it is to be expected, and may be plausibly put forward and defended.

DANGERS OF STATE MONOPOLY

If yielded to, it leads to the enslavement of the people. Give a government the monopoly of education, with all that the monopoly involves; place the whole youth of a country, during their most docile and impressionable years, in the hands of a class or of a clique, who work upon them daily, through trained agents, in pursuance of

a cleverly devised and common plan: it requires little imagination to realize how soon the mind and will of the country must be in the keeping of the Government; which may thus come to rule public life with the same absolutism with which it rules education. In this way some 40,000 Freemasons dominate the internal life and the foreign policy of forty millions of Frenchmen. Freemasonry captured the French Government nearly fifty years ago; it took possession of the schools; drove out opponents; and it is now the firmly-established master of a population which, in the main, is well content to serve it. In Germany, too, the State was sole schoolmaster. State autocracy, as personified in the Sovereign, was taught universally in the schools; and the people came to submit in great majority, and with more than resignation, to a system which robbed them of all the substance, if not of all the forms, of liberty. Had they been successful in the recent war, their enslavement would have become still more complete. As it was, they were driven into war, and they were defeated in the war, through the slave spirit and the despotism which German education had created.

Does any such danger exist among ourselves? It is, of course, impossible to say with any certainty. Our present is too confused, our future too ambiguous, to allow of forming an assured opinion. New Governments are not less liable, are sometimes more liable, than old-established ones to the temptation of centralizing authority, and of bearing down opposition by force. The "English Commonwealth" in the seventeenth century, the "Committee of Public Safety" at the close of the eighteenth century, and now the Russian Soviet, are striking instances of such liability. Besides, not a few of our theorists have been influenced by German ideals and German methods, have drawn their philosophy of education from German sources, and may be predisposed to exaggerate the value of minute organization, of rigorous uniformity, and, above all, of an omnipotent central authority. Indeed, we have already had a foretaste of the German spirit and German system in some very peremptory orders issued to Irish schools since they came under purely Irish management. We will hope that the precedent may not broaden down into many and oppres-

sive instances. It would be lamentable to find, after all our sacrifices to achieve liberty, that, in education, we had only exchanged one tyranny for another.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

The modern State would seem, therefore, to have misconceived its functions and exceeded its powers in much of its interference with education. And what of the Church? The mission of Christ's Church, we know, is to preach the Gospel of Christ, to administer His Sacraments, to watch over the members of His mystical body: "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you"; "Feed My lambs . . . feed My sheep." The Church was not established by Christ, the Apostles and their successors were not sent by Christ, for temporal ends. They are charged to carry on Christ's own work for souls, not to engage in mere earthly projects or earthly pursuits. They have no direct concern with the material prosperity of nations, with their social or intellectual conditions, with politics, art or science, or secular interests of any kind. They have no direct call to build schools and colleges, or to found universities; as they have none to establish orphanages and hospitals or to busy themselves with any works of corporal mercy. Their commission is a spiritual one.

But it should be borne in mind that the Church, within the State, has at least the same rights as any other voluntary association; her clergy have the same rights as any other citizens. As against the State, the Church has the same liberty to open schools as the State itself: the State, we have seen, can claim no monopoly in education. And her clergy and religious have the same liberty to teach as any lay persons; they are citizens; and they incur no civil disqualification by entering into religion or the priesthood. Let us even suppose for the moment that they are unfaithful to a plain religious duty, in undertaking the work of education: the State, its legislators and rulers, have not been appointed to keep watch over the Church and her ministers, and to provide that they shall comply with their spiritual obligations. As well might

the civil government forbid the clergy to own land and till the soil, or to write for the newspapers and to publish works of science.

USING OUR CIVIL RIGHTS

And Church and clergy are unfaithful to no duty when they make use of civil rights for the furtherance of religion. Vital spiritual interests are often involved in things which may appear at first sight to be almost wholly earthly. When the Kultur-kampf was impending in Germany, the parliamentary elections were a matter of far-reaching importance to Catholicism. Such, too, was the case in France, when it was proposed to expel the teaching Orders, to abolish the Concordat, to confiscate the Church's property. The eternal welfare of countless souls may depend on the decisions taken at a Council of Versailles or a Conference of Genoa. In the wards of a hospital or of a home for the dying, spiritual interests of the gravest moment are at stake. Therefore the Church urges her children at times to take part in parliamentary elections; and she endeavors to influence politicians; and she establishes nursing Congregations, encourages them to found institutions, and appeals to the Faithful to assist them. Now, in no other sphere is religion so evidently at stake, if we may except the formal preaching of the Gospel, as in that of education. An impressionable age, unformed mind and heart, natural inclination to believe, ignorance of evil, freedom from the grosser passions: all these circumstances make the season of youth, the time of instruction and of study, a fruitful field in which to carry on the Church's Divinely appointed work. May the Church stand aside, and make no effort to fulfil her mission in the schools? And, if the true religion be shut out officially from them, if colleges and universities are as pagan as the schools, surely the Church is called on to establish, if she may, schools and colleges and universities of her own, in which the atmosphere is Catholic, and the teaching is in accord with Catholic principles, in which God's law is held in honor, and Catholic worship and practises are in frequent and general use? Hence she does nothing more than bare duty, when she maintains her own primary and secondary schools in the United States, in England, Belgium, France, Australia, and others

of the English colonies; and when she establishes great Catholic universities, like those of Washington, Georgetown, Fordham, and St. Louis, with their departments of letters, law, medicine, science and the rest, in North America; the *Instituts Catholiques* in France; the famous University of Louvain in Belgium; and the new Italian University which Italian Catholics, with the cooperation of their Bishops and the blessing of the Holy See, are setting up in Milan.

THE CHURCH'S OBLIGATIONS

I would not be understood to contend that the Church, as an organized society, acting through Pope and Bishops, should engage in the work of secular education without necessity. What is not contained directly in her Divine commission the Church should not necessarily be busied with; the time, energy, attention given to it must be taken from the spiritual work, for which she has been established. But, if, for that spiritual work, she finds it necessary to set up places of education, in which her children's minds and hearts may be formed on the pattern of Christ and on His teaching, she is not merely entitled, she is bound, if it be possible, to do so.

And, if there be any among her members, men or women, lay or clerical, who desire to take a part in the great work of Catholic education, who are competent to give secular instruction, and give it, but assign to it a secondary place, far below religious and moral training, she will, of course, encourage their desire. Who else after Catholic mothers, can so effectively assist her in the mission on which she has been sent? If, further, some among them would join their efforts, would unite together, to secure a greater and more enduring efficiency; if they choose to bind themselves to one another and to God's service by specialties; if they decide to live a common life, and dress after a common pattern, that is their own private concern, which will meet, we may be sure, with glad approval from the Church, but has no bearing upon their duties, rights, or privileges as teachers. Has no bearing, that is, in the eyes of the State, and of educational authorities. It is no business of theirs whether or no a teacher has taken Holy Orders or made vows in religion. Teachers may be lawyers or doctors without question; why not

friars, nuns, or priests? But Catholic parents take it into account. They generally, when a choice is open to them, entrust the education of their children to the priests and teaching Orders of the Catholic Church. We shall not now discuss the wisdom of their choice. We only desire to note that they are clearly within their rights in acting as they do; and that priests and religious are clearly within their rights in accepting and carrying out the trust.

The Importance of Religious Education

THE HON. NATHAN L. MILLER

*An Address Given by the Governor of New York at the
Commencement Exercises of the Child Jesus Parish
School, June 19*

THERE is one distinguishing feature, one distinguishing quality, which elevates man above the animal kingdom, and that is the desire, the yearning, which mere material things cannot satisfy. That desire and yearning lead us to strive for something better and higher and nobler; and in that strife, we develop our mental, moral and spiritual natures. This is no doubt an age of materialism. Invention, the arts and sciences, have developed to a high state of perfection the things which minister to man's material comfort; and undoubtedly, the pursuit of the material was never more keen. Hence it is important that religion and education shall fan the Divine spark which distinguishes man from the animal, shall stimulate us to strive to rise above the material toward the ideal, away from sordid selfishness to a contemplation of the purpose and meaning of human life.

Organized society, what has here been termed the State, has made it possible for the human race to progress towards its ideal, toward the realization of the great Divine purpose, and to insure the continuance of that progress, it is necessary that we maintain, that we strengthen, and that we securely guard the foundations and the pillars upon which the State rests. The home and its influences supply the foundation; religion, morality, education, public virtue

are the pillars which rest upon that foundation. Religion, yes, the Ten Commandments, do supply the foundation for morality. Without religion and morality, education might be more harmful than helpful, for public virtue springs from religion, morality and education. These statements may seem platitudes, although their truth will not pass unchallenged in these days, and however trite, they will bear repeating. I place religion first as the pillar among the pillars, the supports of the State.

There are many people these days who think that we are becoming irreligious; that religion is losing its hold. If that be true, all the more need of strengthening religious influence, because without the restraining influence of religion and of religious teaching and example our youth would be cast upon a chartless sea without rudder or compass to guide them, drifting hither and yon as their own selfish desires might direct. Whilst I have said that religion is one of the pillars of the State, and whilst religion is undoubtedly the main bulwark against the attacks upon the State, which proceed from irreligion, from the Socialistic tendency to destroy religion, the home and the State, yet with us the State cannot itself be directly concerned in the promotion of religious instruction, in the support of religion, and cannot combine religious instruction with secular education. To do that would almost inevitably lead to the support of a particular religion or religions and possibly to the repression of others. And this is a land of religious liberty where all religions have equal freedom, equal liberty and equal opportunity. Fortunately, that freedom from State interference creates an atmosphere which is most conducive to the development of the best religious thought and to the spread of the most effective religious teaching.

But in the matter of education, and by that I mean secular education, the case is different. Free government depends upon public opinion. It will succeed or fail to the extent that public opinion is enlightened, and that enlightenment can come only in proportion to the capacity of the people for self-enlightenment. Hence it is true, as Father Nummey has said, that the State has a right to insist that all of its people shall be given that capacity for self-enlightenment.

THE MEN OF TOMORROW

Our boys and girls of today, these boys and girls, and the other boys and girls who are graduating in other schools over our fair land, will comprise the State tomorrow. What they think, what they are, what they do, will determine the condition of the State, yes, the condition of the world, and the progress of the human race. And, whilst the State is deeply concerned with or about their religious training and instruction, with us the State cannot concern itself directly with such instruction. That, for reasons which I have stated and for others which are obvious, must be left to the teachers of the faith to which each belongs. However, the State is not only concerned about, but has the duty directly to concern itself with the mental development and the physical well-being of these boys and girls, and it is its duty to provide for the education of all who are not otherwise provided for, and it may, as has been said with great propriety, impose the standard to which they shall conform; the educational standards, that is, not the religious standard.

To play a useful part in our social and political life, it is necessary to understand the language of our laws; the language of our history and of our traditions, the language of American thought, of American customs, and American ideals. And so the lesson of the hour is that those who are charged with the duty of giving spiritual direction and guidance and of giving religious training upon the one hand, and the State charged with responsibility of providing for secular education in the public schools upon the other hand, must, each in their own respective spheres make a survey, find out wherein they have been remiss, find out wherein there have been shortcomings, if any, and having ascertained that, must then put forth renewed and redoubled efforts, each again, as I say, in its own sphere, to provide for the mental, the moral and the spiritual welfare of our people. And I am glad to say that in such a survey it will evidently be found that your school will be close to the top, because I have heard of none with such a record as we have heard here tonight.

RESULTS OF OUR EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS

Now that effort or those efforts, each in its sphere will be reflected in public virtue, which I have said springs

from general morality and education, from the contemplation of the Divine purpose and meaning of human life, from the desire for something better and nobler which that contemplation begets, and from the satisfaction which it produces in rendering service to promote the progress of the race.

There are, surely, disquieting signs about us, and commencement time is a favorite one to hear of all these disquieting signs. There are, no doubt, evils which need to be remedied. There are wrong tendencies which need to be corrected. Undoubtedly, there is much food for the pessimists who say, and perhaps truly, that free government is still on trial, the civilization itself is in peril.

Doubtless, this is a material age. Doubtless, selfishness plays too large a part in both public and private life. There are signs of a tendency to revolt from the restraints of religion, of law and of order. But as we look about us, we can find hopeful signs, signs such as we have witnessed here tonight. These boys and girls saluting the Flag and reciting the Ode to the Flag evidence here and there that those able to serve are more and more showing their willingness to serve.

There may be ills and evils afflicting us, but certainly the standards of both public and private morality are higher today than ever. Civilization is progressing, and with that progress life becomes more complicated and more intense, and human needs multiply. So the great need of the world today is for men and women of high purpose and lofty ideals to render service, service first in the home, service in the schools, service in the church, service to society, service to the State; and it is one of the great functions of religion and education to inspire those ideals, and that unselfish purpose. The American people have never failed when put to the test to demonstrate that they are willing to sacrifice and to serve for their ideals. They have demonstrated, too, that they are a nation of lofty ideals and high purpose. They have demonstrated their capacity for self-government, which involves also self-restraint. They have proven their love for order and liberty. This growing disposition to render service more and more should lead us to have courage, to have faith, to have hope, to have confidence in the ultimate fulfilment of what we believe to be God's destiny for the American

people, and that is to become the leaders for the betterment of the human race.

Catholic Parents' Obligations

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

HERE is the law: Unless they entrust their children to a Catholic school all Catholic parents are obliged, under pain of mortal sin, to furnish an equivalent training. True, to genuine good-will God will supply what is wanting, but only a miracle of grace can supply for the lack of a training in a Catholic school. Instruction in a Sunday-school alone, or occasionally after school hours, is not enough. In the abstract it is possible to provide adequately for the child's religious instruction at home. Practically, however, this is rarely possible.

But for the Catholic father who, without episcopal sanction, sends his child to the public school, when he could enter him at a Catholic institution, there is no excuse in heaven or on earth. He has begun the career of Herod; it will be no fault of his if he is not guilty of soul-murder. Let the Catholic father whose child is in the non-Catholic school, or who is minded to place him there, commune with his conscience. The day will come, perhaps very soon, when God will require these children at his hands. Is he willing to stand before the Eternal Judge in the day of his great assizes with this plea: "I might have sent my children to a Catholic school, but, because I had money and position, I sent them to the non-Catholic school. I might have put them under the charge of consecrated men and women who taught that the first duty of every human being was to know, love and serve Almighty God. But I gave them to teachers who dared not assert that an adorable God even existed. I might have brought them to halls in which every head was bowed in silent reverential adoration at the very mention of the Name of Jesus. But I took them to schools from which the Saviour of the world would have been excluded had He entered to teach His doctrine of humble, unwavering acceptance of Him, and of service and love. I knew the plain law of the Church, and I disobeyed it. I might have given good example, but I scandalized my weaker brethren by inducing them to follow where I had led. I knew what my

duty was, but I was deaf to the warning and to the pleading of those set to rule me in God's place. I consulted my own desires, and I laughed at authority, and I said that the Catholic school was no place for the children of a family so refined and cultured, of a father so wealthy and influential as myself."

THE TEST OF PRACTICAL FAITH

Dare any Catholic enter that plea before the judgment-seat of an omniscient and omnipotent God? If not, let him not file it in time by sending his children to a non-Catholic school. Let him not call himself a practical Catholic because he goes to Mass on Sundays, and to the Sacraments occasionally, but for five days a week entrusts his children to a system which the Church forbids him to approve. Let the test of his practical acceptance of the teachings of the Catholic Church be made in this question: "Are his children in a Catholic school?" For the man who sends his children to the public school when he could obtain for them the blessings of a Catholic education is not a practising Catholic, even though he goes to Mass every morning, and, by his silence touching the necessary matter in Confession, is absolved every night.

Assuredly, God will hold the Catholic parent responsible for his fulfilment of this most serious obligation to secure for his children to the best of his ability a moral and religious education. If he can do this while sending his children to a non-Catholic school, well and good, provided the Bishop gives his approval. But in not one case in a million can he secure, without the aid of a Catholic school, the training which the law makes imperative.

In these evil days the world has risen up against God and His Christ; in philosophy, in science, in literature, in the market-place, in the amusements of the people, above, all, in the school. In God's dear name let Catholics at least be willing to suffer inconveniences, loss, even obloquy, that their little ones, redeemed by the Precious Blood of the Son of God, may be brought to the Heart of Christ through the sure portals of a Catholic school.